This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

OCT 1913

What Is The Carnal Mind?

By Rev. D. F. Brooks
Troy Conference Evangelist

AUTHOR OF
"FROM BETHABARA TO PENTECOST"
"ST. JOHN AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE"

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CO.
CHICAGO ——— BOSTON

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
345459
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1905

Copyright, 1905
by
THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CO.

PREFACE.

This book is intended as a reply to the many questions propounded to the author by many people whom he met in his evangelistic tours across the country in the course of nearly four years.

Many of them came from opposers of entire sanctification as a separate work of grace subsequent to conversion, expecting to place us in an unanswerable dilemma.

The conflict is upon the question of eradication as distinguished from suppression as the best state for the Christian now in this life.

If the holiness people give up eradication they give up all, for without that there is no such thing as entire sanctification in this life.

No one ever has been able, nor will be able, to answer the argument from the New Testament, that eradication and not suppression, is the doctrine taught there, and that instantaneously and perfectly now and here.

This book is intended to be a handbook for many holiness evangelists and all holiness people everywhere, and for all others who desire to know what the Bible teaches as to the cleansing from Inbred Sin now.

It is sent forth with prayer that many may see what

the cause of all their spiritual troubles is, and that they may come to the fountain opened to the house of David for all uncleanness and be made whole of all their moral maladies and go on in the triumph of a clean heart all their days.

D. F. BROOKS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

SCRIPTURAL.

What God says. The 51st Psalm. Ephesians 2: 3. Meaning of verb "Shapen." Revised version. By nature, not creation. Rom. 5: 12. John 3: 6. Nature and grace. What does the phrase, "Old Man" mean? A discovery! The phrase "Not of the sins" not in the genuine text. Galatians 5: 19 and 24 contrasted. God's diagnosis. Distinction between Carnal, Flesh, Flesh-y, Flesh-ly, and Soma (the Body).

CHAPTER II.

THE THREE SELFS.

Why the doctrine has been misunderstood. Several passages of Scripture explained. Babyhood and Babyish. Why some have not, and cannot write clearly upon this question. Jesus Christ never had any carnality to be cleansed from. The history, translation, and application of I. Cor. 1: 3. Meaning of "Hagias menois," I. Cor. 1: 1. Carnality not of me, nor on me, but in me. Some modern notions not "Back to Pentecost," but to the Hottentots. Carnality no constituent, nor necessary quality of human nature. Sin not in God's plan. Definition of carnality. Some Psychological heresies punctured. Difference between sensuous and sensual. Distinction between a disordered brain, stomach, liver, and Inbred Sin.

CHAPTER III.

THEOLOGICAL TERMS.

Thirty-five in all. Racial effect of sin. Theologically invented but God inspired.

CHAPTER IV.

IT IS UNIVERSAL.

"Old Man of us all." Difference in the two verbs, "To enslave" and "To enslave completely." Correct meaning and application of verb, Destroy, of Rom. 6: 6. What is "The Body of Sin?" Inbred sin and the moral goodness of God. Definitions.

CHAPTER V.

AN IRRESPONSIBLE STATE.

Inherited not acquired. Illustrations. Not responsible for having it, but for keeping it. Difference between a converted clean heart, and an entirely sanctified clean heart. Great Physician. The difference between the discovery of its immoral nature and its vicious character. Preaching it never divides the church. Symptoms of its presence. Is it only for the preachers? Buckley demolishes Huntington. Moral quality and the will. How is it ours? Regret and guilt. Rom. 5: 12 correctly translated.

CHAPTER VI.

THE STATE AND ACT OF SIN.

Why call it sin? How did Adam and Eve sin? Theoretical and experimental sin. An absurdity. Hathorn

Spring illustration. Carnal and minding carnality. What was the Body that Paul kept under? Volition and desire. Inbred sin and passion. Inbred sin and the will. A thought of an evil, and an evil thought. No mind sanctification to prevent the temptations of the devil. Wm. Taylor on instincts. An exegesis of Rom. 6: 6.

CHAPTER VII.

HOW REMOVED.

Never pardoned. Cannot spank it out of the baby. The red pump handle. Purge, Cleanse, Kill, etc. Aorist tense in Forgive and Cleanse. How can inbred sin be returned to the heart again? Meaning of the verb, "Phero," at Heb. 6: 1. Not removed by piecemeal. No such thing as deeper death. Faber's doleful hymn. Meaning of term, "Vile Body." Human personal self, not the sin principle. Difference between nervousness and impatience. No eradication at death. The mind of Christ. Scriptures cited to prove instantaneous cleansing.

CHAPTER VIII.

MUST WE THEN COMMIT SIN?

A sinning Christian and a white blackbird. Squeeze into heaven. Boy and preserves. False views of conversion. The queer dilemma of an objector. Spurious sinning and repenting described. Paean of triumph.

THE STATE OF SINFULNESS. OLD MAN. INBRED SIN. CARNALITY, ETC.

CHAPTER I.

SCRIPTURAL.

Let us see what God says about this form of sin in the written and revealed Word. We will not examine all the passages in which it is taught, but will call your attention to only a few of them. In the 51st Psalm and in the fifth verse are these words: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," and, according to Whedon's Commentary, Eph. 2: 3, "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others," is of the same import, and both teach the doctrine of Inbred and Inborn Sin.

That is, the verb rendered, "shapen," denotes being born. The term "in sin" refers to sin in the nature, or to a sinful nature—a sinful activity within as soon as born into this world. He was acknowledging a sinful being, not a sinning act.

The passage from Ephesians proves the universality of this natural state, for Paul says, "Among whom also we *all* had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of

somewhere, that worked, and Paul says worked it out; worked out what? Why, the sinful practice. Now that this state of an entity, or state of life, or internal activity, did exist back of, and exert itself in spite of his will, is proven by the 15th and 16th verses, as follows: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that I do."

Lit, Greek: "For what I work out, I do not own; for not what I will, this do I; but what I hate, this I practice."

This proves that the sin principle or carnality exists independently of, and operates in spite of, the volitional element, or without the consent of the will and many times in spite of the protests of the will.

No matter just now whether Paul discovered this inner sin principle AFTER or BEFORE his conversion, HE DISCOVERED IT! and made the distinction with a difference, Huntington and Mudge, or Coe, or Bowne, et al. to the contrary, notwithstanding.

When he wrote the book of Romans he was not enjoying the misery of the experience he describes in the seventh chapter, after the fourteenth verse, for I. and II. Thess. was written six years before Romans, and the first Thessalonian chapter gives his experience by his own hand as follows: "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly, and unblameably, we behaved ourselves among you that believe."

And Corinthians was written about one year before Romans. In the 12th verse of the first chapter of the second letter you will find these words: "Greek." "For our boasting is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and (Agiotati, instead of eilikrineia, L. T. Tr. A.) holiness, of God (not in fleshly wisdom), but in the grace of God, we had our conduct in the world."

In Colossians 2: 11 this sin is called "* * * Body of Carnal." The phrase "Of the Sins" is not in the proper text, hence omitted by G. L. T. Tr. A. W. because circumcision was a single act, and the plural noun is not right.

In Colossians 3: 9 this sin is again called "Old Man," the same as in Rom. 6: 6.

Jeremiah asks this question: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Let God answer that question.

Gen. 6: 5, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." This is a description of the heart in its racial aspect, without regeneration. So also is Gen. 8: 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth."

And the Apostle Peter informs us that God is acquainted with the heart of the race, for we read in Acts 15: 8: "And God, which knoweth the hearts." And Jesus said in Mark 7: 20: "For from within out of the heart of men (Anthropon, race of men) proceed evil thoughts,

adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within and defile the man."

Paul said also in Gal. 5: 19-21: "Manifest now are the works of the carnal, which are adultery, fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, indignations, contentions, divisions, dissensions, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revels, and things like these."

This is God's diagnosis of the moral malady of the whole human race, some college professors, and modern theological writers, would try to make us believe that God, and Christ, and Paul, and Wesley, were not acquainted with true Psychology, and if they had lived in their day would not have taken such erroneous views.

The prevailing religion at Corinth was a sensual Paganism. The Phoenician abomination prevailed. A hotbed of wealth and effeminacy. The lowest vices were practiced.

I believe the Greek language is a beautiful and appropriate medium through which to convey to us the nice shades of meaning in relation to the spiritual, and physical, defining and describing the jurisdiction of each.

Now we have this word "Carnal" from the Greek word "Sarx" and in some places from the derivative adjectives, Sarkinos and Sarkikos.

The words carnal and flesh are from the same root word. But there are other words in the New Testament, such as butcher's meat, flesh in that respect, as in Rom. 14: 21, and I. Cor. 8: 17 (Kreas). Several other words, as Meat, Flesh, Meals, Victuals, Rations, etc.

Another word the animal body (Soma). An animal body as a sound whole. Sometimes literal and sometimes as a figure in I. Cor. 9: 27; Rom. 6: 6. Hence sometimes "My Body." And "The Body of Sin."

Sarx means primarily, flesh, and is used in the New Testament one hundred and forty-four times. Literally, that which lies between the skin and the bones.

Sarkinos means Flesh-y. Of which a thing is composed.

Sarkikos means "Flesh-ly, or like flesh." Not abstract flesh, but like it in some particular respect.

Hence Sarkinos means all flesh, or all carnal or entirely unregenerate. But when in place of the letter n, the letter k is put in its place and spelled Sarkikos, it means not all flesh or carnal, but partly so, and hence called flesh-ly or as the carnal, and refers as a rule to the converted folks.

CHAPTER II.

WHAT IS THE CARNAL MIND? PHYSICAL SELF? INFIRM SELF? FLESH?

The blessed doctrine of Entire Sanctification, as a second distinct work of grace, has often been misrepresented because a proper discrimination was not made between what such a work did for, and in the subject, and what was left to be done at glorification.

The church members do not need scolding so much as they need teaching upon this most vital, and eternally necessary, matter.

The sum and substance of what we have to say in this article may not clarify the mental and spiritual atmosphere perfectly, but we hope and pray some may be helped to a better understanding of a somewhat complex question.

The abstract meaning is flesh as separated from the skin and bones. That which is situated between the outer skin and the inner bones. Hence it is not the whole body but only a part of it.

It is essential that we keep this in mind as we proceed in our investigations. I do not mean by this that the carnal mind is any necessary part of our being.

By figure therefore when the spiritual life is in view,

it refers to the animal physical as opposed to higher spiritual.

In eighteen passages out of the one hundred and forty-four places where the word Sarx occurs it means by figure the carnal mind and is translated in the King James version by the word flesh.

I will give only a few representative passages of each. First, then, where it means carnal. Rom. 7: 5: "For when we were in the flesh the motions of sins." Sometime and somewhere whoever is referred to here was dominated by carnality. (Sarx, Flesh.)

The converted life is one free from condemnation, and an indwelling power not to be led by the remaining carnality.

II. Peter 2: 10. * * * "After the flesh" (carnal). I. John 2: 16, * * * "The lust of the flesh" (carnal). Col. 2: 11-13; Eph. 2: 3; II. Cor. 7: 1. The reader can readily turn to these latter and see the force of the use of this term.

It is translated carnally once. Rom. 8: 6: "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." The literal rendering would be about as follows: The minding of carnality is death, but to mind the Holy Ghost is life and peace.

One who is controlled by carnality completely, is dead in trespasses, and in sins, but one who is not dominated by it has a controlling spiritual life and there is holy

peace. These terms as here employed express a radical contrast between the lost and saved.

It is also translated carnal twice. Rom. 8: 7. "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be." This passage proves the use of the term Sarx when the character of depravity is referred to. Its eternally permanent badness and opposition to God and His will is here stated. No legal or moral process, or act of God or man can change its disposition. It will never take the oath of allegiance to heaven's ruler.

Some active principle of evil within which was at war with the spiritual. Hence it may and can reside side by side with the spiritual, but never without friction. Heb. 5: 12-14 refers to the same condition.

Hence the relation of a child and an heir to God never changes with any advanced state, or stages in grace, but the childish condition and conduct does change in such higher states, because the cause (carnal remains) has been removed. The disease has been cured and hence the symptoms disappear.

No advancement whatever repudiates our adoption or childhood relation to God, but the babyish condition is to be exchanged for Christian manhood.

Let us note at this point that the word flesh in the sense of carnality is used nowhere in the four gospels. It is distinctly Pauline and used also by Peter and John.

And hence the logical and discriminating Paul exhorts the believers at Ephesus not to be childish and babyish (*Napios*) in the following language:

Eph. 4: 14: "That we be no more children (*Napios*) tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." No! stay in the church and spread it, and face the consequences of your conduct and ideas with holy heroism.

Carnality prevents Christian manhood, and keeps many adults babyish. The word *sarx* is also translated by the word fleshly in four places, and has the force of this phrase: "Similar to Flesh." I. Pet. 2: 11; II. Cor. 1: 12; Col. 2: 18; II. Cor. 3: 3.

Paul teaches us the same principle at Heb. 5: 13: "For that every one that useth milk, is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe." (*Napios, childish or babyish.*)

This is a just rebuke to a class of Christians who like those at Corinth were carnal, old babes. For considering their advantages, in having been taught the first principles and advanced principles, too, of salvation very thoroughly, they ought to have gone onward into Christian perfection (Heb. 6: 1) and to have been teaching and leading others into the same blessed life.

This is some of this holy man's sweet irony to rebuke preachers and people for their lack of personal spiritual power, and objective efficiency.

Let us read now a passage which clearly shows us the difference in the use of the term *flesh.* Rom. 8: 10: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."

Now it is evident that the apostle was not talking to disembodied spirits. The term flesh here does not then refer to our physical, but to our moral nature. Here is where so many get confused in their thinking.

Paul was talking to people who had bodies with all the faculties of the mind, and functions of the body in full exercise.

Again Paul says, Rom. 8: 8: "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Now this cannot mean while here in this physical for Enoch pleased God and had the distinct testimony while in his living body.

A man in carnality displeases God, and whatever is displeasing to God can be removed.

A man may be carnal and not carnally minded, that is, may not be dominated by it.

It may be said, therefore, that in the case of the unregenerate, where the carnal completely controls the whole man, it embraces the whole personality and includes the carnal and personal ego.

When the sinner reaches the condition of regeneration he has a controlling energy, and when the spiritual climax of entire sanctification is obtained he has gotten to the deliverance point.

The physical body still exists, but not as an instrument of sin, but of righteousness unto holiness; thus the body is sanctified, because the old man is crucified and dead so far as the subject is concerned.

Speaking in general terms, the conscience is a faculty which prompts to choose the right and reject the wrong, but the carnal mind or fleshly, must therefore interfere with its normal operation.

Therefore no one can write coherently or correctly upon the deep spiritual experiences described in the Epistles with this incubus on the moral faculty, and so it comes to pass that all the books ever written against the precious doctrine of cleansing from inbred sin, have in greater or less measure misstated the questions involved. The doctrine of entire sanctification as a second distinct work, can never be faulty except upon a misrepresentation of definitions and terms.

The early apostles were very frequently in error and misapprehended the statements of Christ and were never allowed to be transmitters of divine truth until they were both cleansed from carnality and filled with the Holy Ghost.

They were positively forbidden to teach, and it is certain they did not write, until they had received their pentecost. Luke 24: 49; Acts 1: 4, 5.

This also accounts for the failure of many excellent people to see the force of many moral questions, and to

feel a proper obligation toward right conduct in relation to them, for the carnal mind is at enmity with God and his laws, then its character can never be changed and therefore as long as it continues to exist in any one it will be an obstructor, and an obscurer in the medium through which spiritual blessings are to reach the people, whether it be in the man or the book he writes.

From the foregoing scriptural references and legitimate principles deduced therefrom we have the following resulting truths:

There is a natural and physical self, God-given and related as it is for his glory in this earthly existence.

And that clinging to this as a collateral result of the fall in Adam there are many infirmities or an infirm self, and we shall possess both of these as long as we live in this world. And we must never call them sins nor carnality.

But the carnal self, or carnal mind, is the disturber of the peace, and an aggravator, and causes the wicked perversion of this personal physical and infirm self.

The personal physical self is not the carnal self, and we must thus distinguish what the Bible tells us is not the same. The human personal self is not the fleshly principle. *Sarx* may not be *Sarkinos,* and neither one of these may refer to *Soma* the whole body, but only to some part of this whole.

Hence a holy man is never made so, by the destruc-

tion of any faculty of the mind, or any function of the body, or by starvation, or any self-inflicted torture, or by any ante-mortem, or post-mortem special and extraordinary illumination in either period of time.

There are also a number of places where this noun *sarx* refers to the abstract flesh of the body absolutely free from any carnal principle whatever. A morally spotless being with a human physical structure.

Such a reference is made at Luke 24: 39. When Jesus said to the astonished ones: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have."

Now it is very evident that Jesus did not say, nor means to say, Behold my carnality. No! Behold my personal self, not carnal self, for He never had any of the latter, nor was He ever cleansed from it.

Acts 2: 31, * * * "Neither his flesh did see corruption." This is a reference to the resurrection of Jesus in his literal body. Now, no one will say that any reference is here intended to the survival of carnality in the Divine Son of God up to the time of his departure from Joseph's new tomb. The word flesh (sarx) here means his personal physical self, not carnal self.

Rom. 9: 3, * * * "My kinsmen according to the flesh" (*sarx*). Paul here refers not to persons related to him bv indwelling personal carnality, but physically per-

sonal relatives and possibly his fellow Hebrew Chosen People.

Phil. 1: 24, "Nevertheless to abide in the flesh (*sarx*) is more needful for you." Paul is here disclosing an inner mental certitude by contrast. He knew it meant perfect and eternal rest from the wear and tear of the work among the provinces of Asia Minor, and the peninsula of Greece, and about the boot-leg of Rome, to be in heaven, and out of this material universe, and physical body, but it were far better for the churches, then in their infancy, and doctrinally formative period to stay with them in his physical, not carnal, self-hood to teach them.

I. Tim. 3: 16, "God was manifest in the flesh" (*sarx*). Personal and not carnal self.

I. Jo. 4: 2, "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (*sarx*) is of God." This cannot mean that Jesus Christ came in carnality, but as a physical person.

Next we have this word *sarx* used in its adjective form either as *sarkikos* or *sarkinos*.

In this form it means, animal, unregenerate, fleshly, sensual. But even in this form it is translated carnal ten times at the following places: Rom. 7: 14, 15: 27 (here referring to temporal supplies), I. Cor. 3: 1, 3: 3, 3: 4, 9: 11; II. Cor. 10: 4, Heb. 7: 16, etc.

Let us take a representative passage that has been often quoted and discussed. And the one John Wesley

used as a great proof-text in his day to prove the possibility of the carnal mind remaining in those who were the children of God.

I. Cor. 3: 1, "And I, brethren could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ."

The Greek word for babe in this text is not the original word for a literal babe. It is *Napios* and means childish, and babyish. It is used figuratively and illustrates the effect of the carnal mind upon believers in preventing their spiritual advancement.

Considering the length of time they had been in the way, they ought to have been manly Christians, but their external and uncalled for strifes showed their babyish condition.

Paul calls them carnal babes, and not carnal men, hence they were not wholly unregenerate men.

It cannot refer to their lack of knowledge, for the reference is to their moral condition alone. Had the apostle intended to have referred to their literal understanding, he would have used the word *Brefos* (a literal infant) and not *Napios* (a babyish fellow).

Read carefully the exegesis of the history, translation and application of this passage as follows:

Let us critically examine this text (I. Cor. 3: 1) from two points of view. First from its historical setting.

Second from a close examination of the exact meaning of the terms employed.

This letter was written four years after the church was founded. Acts 18: 1. A. D. 55, and written in A. D. 59.

To whom was this epistle addressed? "Lit, Greek." To the assembly of God, which is in Corinth, having been sanctified in Christ. (Hgiasmenois, Per. Partic.) (And L. Tr. A. put "Which is in Corinth" after the words, "Having been sanctified in Christ Jesus"). Hence read.

"To the assembly of God having been sanctified in Christ Jesus, which is in Corinth, called saints, or holy ones, with all those in every place calling on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both theirs and ours."

"Those sanctified," "Assembly of God," "Called Saints," are all datives of the quality of which a thing is composed. And means here, the character of all the assemblies of God (or churches) everywhere, through the provisions of the atonement in Christ Jesus."

"Of God" is genitive of the owner. They belonged to God instead of to any one sect.

Hgiasmenois is a plural, Per. Participle, dative case. Standing in an attributive relation to a collective singular noun, "Assembly of God."

The words "Which are in Corinth" are placed after "Sanctified," because the thought is, that the church

of God addressed does in itself and as such, not as Corinthian, consist of those who had been sanctified in Christ, through the provision, hence that is a general appellation of all genuine Christian assemblies. (Meyer.)

Being then a general appellation of all Christians, and not being accompanied by any modified adverb, or any pronouns referring back to any preceding event, by which they reached the state of grace referred to, as in Paul's first Epistle to the Thess., the word sanctified here can only mean the initial state of grace called conversion, or regeneration, produced in them by a personal appropriation of the provision in Christ referred to in the address of the Epistle, they were sanctified (converted), but not entirely sanctified.

The epistle then was addressed to Christians who had been at least four years in the church or thereabouts, and called converted.

Now for these four years some of them had the carnal mind as an experience, and at the same time were brethren in Christ, but in a babyish state on account of the existence of carnality in them.

This is proven by a critical reading of the text as well as by reading it as it is written in the ordinary version, but I will read it from the literal Greek text, and give my interpretation, and translation, as the historical facts will warrant.

"And I also, as well as others who have preached here,

whose names I withhold, could do no better than they did under the conditions, my brothers. I was not able at that time, when I first came here and you were in an unregenerate state, to preach to you as to the regenerate, but to preach to you as any one would to the unconverted, then as babes in Christ, or ones just converted, I fed you with milk. (First principles, elementary truths) and not with meat, (advanced truth), for at that time you were not able to bear it, and neither now after four years of church membership, are you able, for you are yet carnal and babyish, which is proven by your acts of strife and divisions, and you walk about and act according to the race of men."

The history and critical reading of the text proves beyond a doubt that some of them were converted and had carnality in them after the event, and at the same time they were brethren and babes in Christ, carnal babes not carnal men, and that it had continued in them for four years of membership in the church, and its internal existence was proven by their outward babyish conduct.

This state of sinfulness is not in the physical structure, that is it is no constituent quality of the material body.

It is a resident in it, but not of it; hence Paul says it is "Sin that dwelleth in me," and the inference is then that it is not in the MY, but in the ME. Not on me, nor of me, but distinct by itself, and in me.

In I. Cor. 6: 18 Paul writes, "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body."

Lit. Greek: "Every sin which a man may practice is separate, or without, or besides, the body" (Ektos, preposition with a genitive).

The body never sins in the sense of deciding, or determining to do it; it is the agent, or instrument through which the carnal activity operates to bring forth outward acts, the carnal living, moving something, prompts the character of the acts, and the will determines to do the things it prompts.

Those who deny the possibility of the perfect cleansing from inbred sin are driven into all sorts of subtle absurdities; for instance, I quote from one of our Advocates:

"The Christian must go through the grave to heaven where (in the grave) he leaves something as he passes through; that something is inbred sin, plainly designated in the comprehensive phrase. It is sown in corruption. What is this corruption in which man is sown if not the corruption of Adam's sin? Is it not inbred sin that brings physical death? The same that opened the grave for Adam opened it for all mankind."—Southwestern.

Inbred sin means born in; now Adam never had any sin born in him; he was created into this world, and came in immediately, not mediately, by the creative hand

of God direct, and without any sin at all. God never created a man with sin in him, for God never creates sin.

Holy Adam created his own sinful state by his own voluntary act, as the result of personal observation, and personal choice after sufficient instruction from his Creator, and that is just what any holy man has had power to do from that time until now, and that settled the question as to how the sinful state may be reproduced.

The writer of the article above quoted, it will be seen, believes in the old heathen notion that sin resides in the body, and hence all must retain that body of sin until they die, and when physical body decays why, of course, sin will then decay, too.

If sin is all through the body, then to cut off any part of the body would be to destroy a part of sin. The cremation of the body would enable sin to escape in the carbon and ashes; perhaps that accounts for the fact that carbon irritates the throat, and ashes produces sore eyes when filled with it.

Masticated and digested and assimilated food produces this physical structure; how, then, does sin get into the body but through that which produces it? Is sin, then, in the bread, or coffee, or potatoes, or beefsteak, or beets, or turnips, or in the knife and fork, or in the plate, or by what process is sin placed in the body?

Now, as we have had some bright professors in our institutions of learning who have shown that had Paul

and Peter and Wesley lived in this day they would have been ashamed of their psychology, so now we may expect as a further revelation from this same source that Paul and Peter and Wesley also were idiotic in their physiology.

This is not back to Pentecost, but back to the Hottentots.

And if this modern heresy be true, then all sin is left in the grave, and if that be true, then every sinner that goes to hell will be without any sin because he left it all in the grave.

And if Christians only come under this gracious provision, according to this new exegetical lunacy, then death, decay and dissolution under the ground is a substitute, and more efficacious than the blood of Jesus Christ.

John says the "blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin," and also that the "Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil"; but the sin killing grave theory makes sin too strong for the Son of God. And if it be said that Jesus' blood does it in the grave, then if it can do it in the grave, why may it not prove available before death?

Neither is this state of sinfulness any constituent quality of abstract human nature. God never made our human nature with anything wrong in it primarily.

God made the first human pair and placed within them

a human nature, just as we all have now. That is, we all have a human nature. In our fallen state of sinfulness this human nature is attacked by this carnality in an attempt to pervert its legitimate functions.

At first there was no such thing to attack Adam from the inside, yet he had a human nature, God created, for a proper purpose, and in the abstract it was never wrong in him nor anybody else.

Now the Bible says that "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him."

And Paul says in substance in Eph. 4: 24 that the image of God in one respect is "True Holiness." Then the construction of human nature to exist without any friction, and in the same body, was a design of God.

In James 3: 9 image of God is called "after the similitude of God."

What is human nature? What do we mean by nature? A law or principle of action, or motion, in a natural body, as a stone naturally falls to the ground, or downward. To desire food and eat. Now then, human nature is that which is natural to the human body and mind. And such a body is referred to in I. Cor. 15: 44, "It is sown a natural body" (Psukikon).

By the nature of man or woman we mean their particular qualities or constitution.

Peculiar temperament of body and affections of the

mind, the natural appetites, passions, disposition or temper, made in each one by the Creator.

I. Cor. 2: 14: "But the natural man (Psukikos) receives not the things of the Spirit."

No! Carnality is neither human nature, nor any constituent quality of it, for it is separate and distinct, both in its essence and moral quality, although human nature of itself has no moral quality, being only a medium, when perverted, through which sin is committed.

As the barnacle (that animal that stealthily fastens itself to the bottom of the ships when not covered with copper) eats in and honeycombs the oak, and which barnacle was not in the plan nor specifications of the architect, so sin entered into this human structure originally by the agency of the devil, the human will consenting, and was not in the plans nor the specifications of the Divine Architect of the human race, but the parasite of sin stole in and fastened to it, and never was, nor is it now, any necessary part of it; that is, no necessary part of our human nature.

By the willful disobedience of one man sin entered into the world originally according to Rom. 5: 12, and in Matt. 13: 28 Jesus illustrated and accounted for the presence of sin in the world in humanity when He replied to the question, "From whence then hath it tares?" that "An enemy hath done this."

The Bible plainly accounts for the introduction of sin

into the universe, and shows that God is not the author of sin, while under the constitution of things sin is possible, yet God never made sin a fact.

All sin is the work of the devil, with the co-operation of the free choice of human responsible agents.

It has been said that Inbred Sin is only a name for the conflict between the animal and the spiritual in man. This does not explain the introduction of sin into the man before he becomes spiritual at all.

Sin is in us before any antagonism is laid in conversion or entire sanctification at all.

Another has located sin in the stomach. Well, I believe it so far as the one who makes that statement is concerned, for evidently he has a disorder in that direction and the delusion is quite easy under the mental hallucination that always ensues from acute dyspepsia.

My definition of this sin is this: Carnality, or inbred sin, is that active, conscious tendency to evil inherited from Adam as the federal head of the whole human race, transmitted wholly *through* immediate ancestry, not *from* them, and is not affected in any way in the process of its descent.

Scripture, Rom. 5: 12; Eph. 2: 3; Psa. 51: 5; I. Cor. 15: 22.

This sinful state is not simply a name for a conflict between the animal and spiritual. Meaning by that the physical man with all the instruments of the animal realm.

The sum total of the physical functions. The animal soul life, and the faculties of the mind, power to reason morally, or immorally.

Some one has said that this conflict is the "sin that dwelleth in me" referred to by Paul at Rom. 7: 17. And also that this is the "body of death" that made Paul cry out "O wretched man that I am."

This to me is pure assumption. There is to be sure a sympathetic relation between the mind and body, and this may be seen when in a room where the air is too hot, or too cold. The mind of the preacher and the congregation are discomfited.

Pain of body by some disease or stage in the disease will put the mind out of its normal operation. We have experienced that many times.

Again, severe mental strain that causes anguish or sorrow for any protracted period will suppress bodily activities.

Again, natural joy will stimulate bodily activities, one will feel happy, look happy, act happy.

What does this prove? It proves that there is a natural sympathetic relation between our mind and body.

How will you remedy the disturbance? Put up the window, let in the fresh air, wash with clean water, keep up the washing, remove the disease from the physical system, keep it removed, and your mind and body will be all right.

It is not Inbred Sin, it is common dirt and foul air, or some trouble in your immediate circle of life.

Remove the mental strain, let the mother's kidnapped boy be returned, then the mind is relieved and she resumes her three meals a day and the mental and bodily harmony is restored.

It was not Inbred Sin as the immediate cause, and hence it did not require the blood of Jesus to remove it, but simply soap, towels and pure air, or quinine and aconite to remove the fever.

This attempt to prove that Inbred Sin can be accounted for by physiological psychology is not going back to Pentecost, but back to the heathenism of the old heathen, ignorant philosophy, and yet some people will swallow most anything now, even when the contents are nothing more than theological sawdust, or philosophical sand, if the thing only has, or seems to have, a scientific label.

Every little schoolboy knows that the body and mind are only hostile to each other when one or the other is in an abnormal condition, and I mean by that an unhealthy or unnatural condition. As long as this natural and harmonious mutual relation exists the mind and body will not be antagonistic to each other.

No! Psychology is heathenish as interpreted by some modern folks that wish to "continue in sin."

There are many forms of sin that take on the sensual through the sensuous, but some sins do not take on that

sensual feature, such as pride felt, revenge felt, unbelief felt.

So that Inbred Sin is not the sensuous body wrought up to a sensual pitch and overcoming the moral reason. Such a state of the bodily functions might prove the existence of this carnal element as a cause; that is, the sensual state of the sensuous body would be the symptom of the existence of the carnal disease, but it never was, nor can it ever be the disease itself.

Therefore, we need something more than a development by any natural process. Neither physical calisthenics, nor any form of athletics, nor any degree of head culture will ever reach the "sin that dwelleth in the me" of the soul's essence, and remove its existence.

Even if any or all the forms of culture which I have mentioned should succeed in preventing those grosser forms of outward sins, yet that culture cannot prevent its inward manifestations that affect the mind and body in a sinful way.

Hence, Paul classifies sin as of the "flesh" and "spirit" in II. Cor. 7: 1, meaning by these terms animal bodily sins, and anger, pride, unbelief and lust in the desire.

Then the word for cleanse never means culture, and the tense of the verb being aorist, cannot mean a protracted process; but an instantaneous removal of absolutely all filthiness in its two-fold form of manifestation through the only two mediums of manfestation—namely,

the body as the material medium, and the spirit as the immaterial medium.

Then the word "perfecting" proves that holiness begun at the moment of conversion is perfect holiness when the complete cleansing has taken place, and the participle "cleansing," being in the present tense, proves that this perfected holiness has only one end, and that one end is the beginning, for this perfected holiness as to its quality is complete, but as to its growth and development it need never end.

That is, you can grow in holiness, but never into it, for the state of perfected holiness, as to its quality, is the result of an act of God, and its growth is contingent upon the continuous fidelity of its possessor.

I prove this from the teachings of Jesus in John 5: 24, where the present tenses are employed to denote continuance of action. "He who is hearing (constantly) my word, and constantly believing on Him, hath eternal life all this time, and is not coming into condemnation all the time, but has passed over (perfect) from death unto life (to stay)." John 6: 35. The same.

No, we can never succeed in locating sin in the disordered brain, or stomach, or liver, or nervous system.

Actual sinning that produces guilt must have the consent of the will, and this makes us responsible, and must be pardoned.

But the climax of salvation for this present world is

the annihilation of sin. So declares the Bible, and hence this Bible view can never be reconciled with any evolution theory, as to producing any state of grace whatever.

This carnality is a separate and distinct quality somewhere within and in no sense either a part of the new creation, or regeneration, or any constituent element of the mind or body or human nature.

Carnality existed before you were converted, separate and distinct from it, and can therefore so exist after regeneration, as well as before it, being no part of it, and never in its primary existence, affecting my justification, and only doing so when its existence and nature, and the remedy for its removal is clearly and intelligently discovered.

This carnal principle, or sinful activity, is felt to be in the farthest, lowest consciousness, and is so proven to exist by the testimony of universal consciousness, and is neither, I repeat, a disordered liver, nor stomach, nor brain, nor is it a conflict between any of these in any form.

The creation of a new heart, and a perfectly clean heart, are the results of two separate acts and events that produce two different moral states.

The new birth by the Holy Spirit is in no part natural nor by the will of man. The natural physical birth is wholly natural and never immediately by the will of God.

Entire sanctification is not a birth, nor a rebirth, or second birth, and is never so referred to in the Bible, but an immediate Divine act of moral cleansing and filling.

CHAPTER III.

THEOLOGICAL TERMS.

These words have been taken from the Scriptures and from terms that have been considered synonymous by writers of prose and poetry:

Terms. Let me give you some of the terms by which this sin is designated, taken from hymns, Scripture and different writers: Inbred or inborn sin, inherited sin, birth sin, original sin, carnal remains, carnal mind, indwelling sin, old man, body of sin, shapen in iniquity, a unit of evil, body of the sins of the flesh, old leaven, root of bitterness, a state, inbred leprosy, seed of sin's disease, yoke of inbred sin, inbred malady, sinful blot, sin's remains, inward sin, tendency to sin, inbred enemy, being of sin, moral corruption, all unrighteousness, hereditary sinwardness, necessitated depravity, residuum of sin, the spirit of sin, sin that dwelleth in the me of the soul, an indivisible unit, common sin that affects the race of man.

Here are thirty-five terms and phrases used to define this sin. I give them that the reader may not get confused when they are used by different speakers. All of them employed to refer to a state of sinfulness, and never to an act of sin. "Inbred sin and some other terms mentioned above, may have been invented by theologians, but

I think God inspired them because the devil hates them so."

Dr. Daniel Steele says:

"This phrase (original sin) is not found in the Bible and ought not to be found in books of theology, because it can never be used without stating that it does not signify sin in its proper sense entailing guilt. (It defines sin in its racial effects, and not sin actual and individual.) It refers simply and solely to the derivation of mankind from a vitiated common stock, said to be sinful because it leans toward sin, and not toward the Divine law and the Divine holiness.

CHAPTER IV.

IT IS UNIVERSAL.

Scriptural proof: Rom. 6: 6: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with (Him) that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

The Greek reads literally thus: "This knowing, that the old man of us all was crucified together with Him, in order that the body of sin might be rendered inoperative, that we no longer be enslaved to (this sin) or the sin" (Tn a'martia). The definite article here makes it the sin principle. And also the noun ends in -ia, denoting the active principle of sin (W. & H. Lex., page 9). While nouns in -ma denote the dead result of the action of the verb (page 9), also in Rom. 6: 6.

(The verb DouloO means to enslave. It is not the verb Kata-dolow, to enslave completely.)

(The verb rendered destroyed is from KatargeO, to render inoperative; bring to nought; to be done away; make barren. I. Aor., Pass.)

"Was crucified" is first, Aor. Pass., and denotes that one feature of the atonement was the provision in the blood of Jesus to produce the eradication of the carnal prin[redacted] our inner selves, and this becomes personal

and experimental when we appropriate by faith such God-provided provision.

This perfectly removes the "old man," or inbred sin, from our inner selves, and thus renders this body with its faculties and functions inoperative by this sin principle, because the sin principle has been removed from my inner being, and it no longer operates in me, nor through me, nor does it OPERATE ME! Hence I am no longer a slave to it as I used to be before it was removed perfectly, and it is always removed perfectly in entire sanctification.

It has no abstract visible form of existence of its own, and therefore it must operate in and through some visible medium than itself, and when Paul refers to it as upon the inside, he calls it "sin that dwells in me," and when Jesus refers to the internal existence of that something He calls it "the unclean spirit" that moves and thinks and resolves upon a definite course of action.

As to the use and interpretation of the verb rendered "destroyed," "KatargeO," the word is used twenty-five times in Paul's writings, and is variously rendered in the A. V., make void, destroy, loose, bring to naught, fail, vanish away, put away, put down, abolish, cease. One Bible scholar says that the word "negatives the idea of agency or operation." To make inefficient.

Luke 13: 7. "Why even does it render the ground *useless*" (Katar gei).

I. Cor. 13:8. "But whether prophecies, they shall be done away" (Katargathasontai).

II. Tim. 1: 10. "Who abolished or annulled death" (Katargasantos).

I. Cor. 1: 28. "The things He may annul, or bring to naught" (Katargnasn).

Rom. 3: 31. "Do we make law then of no effect?" (Katargoumen).

I. Cor. 2: 6. "Who are coming to naught" (TOn KatargoumenOn).

I. Cor. 15: 26. "The last enemy annulled is death" (Katargeitai).

I. Cor. 13: 10. "Then that in part shall be done away" (Katargnthnsetai).

Gal. 5: 4. "Ye are deprived of all effect from the Christ" (Katnrgnthnte).

Heb. 2: 14. "That through death He might annul him who has the might of death; that is, the devil" (Katargnsn).

"The phrase, body of sin, denotes here the body belonging to, or ruled by, the power of sin, in which the members (physical and mental members) are instruments of unrighteousness (Ver. 13). Not the body as containing the principle of evil in our humanity, since Paul does not regard sin as inherent in and inseparable from the body (Ver. 13. II. Cor. 4: 10, 12; 7: 1). (Read Matt. 15: 19.)

Nor is this phrase identical with the "old man," an organism or system of evil dispositions, which does not harmonize with verses 12 and 13, where Paul uses body in the strict sense. Vincent's Word Studies, page 69, on Romans.

"Sin is conceived as the master, to whom the body as slave belongs and is obedient to execute its will. As the slave must perform his definite functions, not because he in himself can perform no others, but because of his actually subsistent relationship of service he may perform no others, while of himself he might as well belong to another master and render other services; so the earthly Soma (body) belongs not of itself, to the Amartia, sin, but just as well belong to the Lord (I. Cor. 6: 13), and doubtless it is, de facto, enslaved to sin, so long as a redemption from this state has not set in by virtue of the Divine Spirit" (Rom. 7: 24). (Dickson, quoted by Vincent, page 69.)

Hence the point emphasized in verse 8 is the real sanctified life of the believer with the life of Christ, rather than in the future glory which is not the point intended in the writing. Compare verse 11.

Then again, the "members" (physical and mental faculties) (Meln) are not to be "instruments" or "weapons" as implements of war, to be used against God and righteousness, but to be used as instruments of war for God and righteousness.

The Holy Spirit has only the same set of mental faculties and physical functions to work in and through that the unholy spirit had.

Eph. 2: 3. "Among whom also (the children of disobedience, in whom worketh the spirit of the devil) we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature (not creation) the children of wrath even as others."

Greek: "Among whom also we all had our conduct once in the desires of our flesh, doing the things willed of the flesh, and of the thoughts, and were (all were, universal) children by nature of wrath even as the rest."

"Children of disobedience." A Hebraism, they tell us. Like "sons of perdition" (John 17: 12.) "Children of disobedience" (I. Pet. 1: 14). "Children of ours" (II. Pet. 2: 14). As a son belongs to a parent, so a sinful being belongs to disobedience as his father, and Adam was the embodied disobedience.

And hence verse 3: We who sinned willfully or ignorantly, all lived in the inherited state of sin, and that was what caused our sinning, because we fulfilled the willings or promptings, carrying out or accomplishing the willings of this inherited state, through the thoughts.

The word "tekna" emphasizes the fact of connection by birth. Wrath (Orgns) is a word that teaches God's hatred of sin and love of law. His natural antagonism

to all sin of every kind. By nature (Phusei) implies what is inborn, or innate. That is, all are born into this world with a sinful nature, more properly with sinfulness in and on the nature, but no part of it. Notice Paul says that ALL come into this world in this way, by inheritance, not from immediate ancestry, but from Adam through them.

Some say this is a created imperfection, by the Creator. Bear in mind, it is not a creation of God, but the result of the work of the devil through Adam.

But allowing the objection, the conclusion of the objector does not follow. For God's works are only perfect, in the sense of being without any deformity, only when the conditions are perfect. For see the deformed animals, trees and children born with poisonous humors in the blood, or seeds of consumption in their systems.

So we have in the teachings of Jesus illustrations of this truth, in Matt. 13, in "wayside effect," "stony places," "among thorns," "good ground." Notice that the difficulty was not with the seed, but in the variety of soil; that is, real constitutional hindrances. The seed could do no better (though it were perfect) under the imperfect conditions.

Many find it difficult to harmonize "the bent to sinning" born in us with the goodness of God. That is because they have forgotten that after Adam's sin the race was continued not under law only, but under law as the

rule of life, and grace sufficient to conquer and ultimately destroy evil propensities, so that where sin abounded grace superabounds in the case of every persevering believer in Christ. No man will ever be condemned to hell for Adam's sin.

In this fallen state everybody comes into this world, and at the proper time accessions to this original depravity or inbred sin begin.

Mental, perversion or depravity, and its growth by bad reading and pictures.

Physical depravity, unlawful use of natural appetite, liquor, lust and tobacco, opium and snuff.

Spiritual depravity, protracted neglect of salvation by faith in Christ, etc.

Think of it! what a dreadful state any responsible boy or girl, man or woman is in, who has never been converted!

May the Holy Ghost wake up the sinner and the saint, as to the true condition and relation of both of them.

Although all children have inbred sin, and all adults, too, from whose hearts it has not been cleansed, yet it does not affect them all alike, because of the natural disposition, more or less good or bad, inherited from their parents who were more or less good or bad. Inbred sin makes some people act cleverly and sweetly, others ugly, etc.

They are naturally so. I have seen a large number of both classes.

Acquired or actual sins all come from this unit of evil, for it comes to all alike, whether the earthly ancestors were holy or unholy in any degree, and is not transmissible in whole or in part from earthly parents of children, it only exists originally by a federal Adamic relation.

"Sin is entailed upon me not by immediate generation, but by my first parent."—*Wesley.*

"Parents with dark complexion, jet black hair and eyes, have a child of light complexion, red hair and blue eyes. The parents have thus transmitted qualities they did not possess, but which on research are found to have prevailed in some remote ancestors."

Although all children have inbred sin, and all adults, too, from whose hearts it has not been cleansed, yet it does not affect them all alike, because of the natural disposition, more or less good or bad, inherited from their parents who were more or less good or bad. Inbred sin makes some people act cleverly and sweetly, others ugly, etc.

Definitions and Illustrations. I am not now referring to the wrong things you do, but to the wicked deeds you are *prompted* to do from the heart, not necessarily all the time, but at intervals of time, depending upon provocation. It operates unrestrained and incessant, in and

out of the unconverted, but in the converted it is occasional and controlled, but often gets sudden advantage, and the person commits visible sin, and sometimes invisible sins of thought and purpose, and is then obliged to repent and be restored to the favor of God.

It does not exist upon the outside of the being, but hidden away in the depths of the soul, ready to spring into activity.

It is a unit and not susceptible of any division, which is in all as soon as they are born, by reason of a federal relation to Adam, and not in any degree dependent upon the mental, moral or physical condition of either parent.

In each babe this sin is the same in size and quantity and quality. In stating this I shall be misunderstood unless I also say, I do not now refer to the peculiarities of different temperaments that are in different persons, through which this inbred sin operates, and produces a variety of outward acts.

No! I am referring to a sinful activity far back of all this, at the center of the human structure—the mainspring of all evil.

Neither am I now referring to depravity of mind and body which may be transmitted to offspring by a well known law of heredity, but to *"The Sin"* inherited from Adam, through no known law of heredity.

The Holy Ghost said, "Through one man sin entered into the world." This Bible statement and human ex-

perience is about all we know about it, as to its origin and descent.

So the term "Inbred Sin" refers to the form and quality and quantity of *sin* which we *cannot see,* but sadly feel, imbedded in the soul, from the form and degree of sins which we *can see* and hear.

No one ever saw depravity or inbred sin, we have only seen its manifestations.

All power in the abstract is invisible. It is no proof you haven't depravity because you don't manifest it. The type of the depravity is modified by ancestry. God visits the iniquity of the fathers unto the third and fourth generation.

Not by two eternal principles coexistent from all eternity.

Nor by human racial descent.

Nor by youthful environment or culture.

It was not cultivated in and it never can be cultivated out.

CHAPTER V.

PRIMARILY AN IRRESPONSIBLE STATE—HOW DID I GET IT?

You inherited it; you did not acquire it. For instance, supposing your father were to give you one thousand dollars to begin a business with, and by your own hard work you added to it ten thousand more. Now you have eleven thousand.

Let the one thousand you inherited stand for inbred sin, and the ten thousand you acquired represent your own responsible added sins.

Now, your father Adam gave you inbred sin to start with; you have used it for ten years (we'll suppose). Now, habit of sin has been formed by you, power of sinning has increased, capacity for sin has enlarged.

Here is the difference between inbred sin and actual sins, or added sins.

Here now, we may see the difference between responsible *sins* and an irresponsible *sin*. Why am I *not* responsible for inbred sin, and at the same time guilty for actual sins? Because I inherited inbred sin and I created my actual sins.

Inbred sin came without my knowledge or consent. A person is no more to blame for having it than he is for having the red colored hair of his father or mother, or for inheriting an appetite for tobacco or rum.

I believe with "Whedon on the Will," "It is one thing to have badness and another thing to be responsible therefor. There can be a created conformity or disconformity to a divine law, but no created merit or demerit therein."

That is, a person can be created with this sinful state, but there can be no created guilt or punishment for having it in the first place, and thank God there is none.

Read carefully now! You are not responsible for having it, *but you are responsible for keeping it.*

"To permit the evil you can prevent is as criminal as committing it." *Ram's Horn, November* 25, 1899.

All individuals sustain an irresponsible relation to its primary existence in them, until a remedy for its removal is presented to them, when, if they refuse to be cleansed, then from that time on they are responsible for its farther retention and all the consequences flowing from it.

Dr. Whedon on Eph. 2: 3: "When these tendencies are deliberately and knowingly acted in real life they are by that action appropriated and sanctioned. Then the man is condemned both for the guilt and the act and the depravity of his nature now responsibly assumed."

So irresponsible, inbred sin may become a responsible sin.

This is evident because it existed before a choice was or could have been made, either to receive, retain or get rid of it. And if a converted person, maintaining his

justified relation to God, who had never come to a conscious intelligent knowledge of his privilege to have it removed, were to die, the blood of Jesus would cover it, as in the case of all irresponsible persons. Because there was neither selection of the sinful condition, nor the rejection of the divine remedy.

The principle is taught us in John 15: 22. "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their *sin.*"

And Jesus also said again, Luke 23: 24, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

I do therefore hurl back into the teeth of infidelity its unjust charge against God, charging Him with unfairness and injustice in bringing us into this world in a fallen condition.

Ignorance absolves from all guilt. A person may be wrong, but innocent. "There is no disadvantage in a soul thus beginning its existence, for redemptive influences reach its needs that more than balance all its injuries."

With the black ink of inherited sin, God writes upon the soul His abhorrence and curse of violated holy law, and with the blood of Jesus He will obliterate (if you will) every trace and vestige of it from the soul, and restore you, not to Adamic perfection, but to Adamic purity, and into your interior, now washed whiter than snow, the Holy Trinity will come to dwell, and you will

have a doxology of spiritual bliss and holy joy that may have a beginning but no ending, and no interruptions. Glory Hallelujah! Get it!

Since faith in Jesus Christ is necessary to salvation, does it not follow that all heathen who never heard of the Savior are excluded from heaven?

"A man who is ignorant of Christ may have the spirit of faith, the disposition to believe in Him and receive Him if He should be presented, and he may also have the purpose of righteousness, the disposition to keep God's perfect law were it revealed. Such persons 'are saved through Christ, though they know Him not,' says John Wesley. The same doctrine is thus expressed by Joseph Cook, 'He who knows not the historical Christ may be saved by the essential Christ'—i. e., by having the moral lineaments of Christ through the Holy Spirit given to the world. This is natural religion, the religion of conscience spoken of by Paul in Rom. 2: 14-16. The doctrine that a knowledge of the historic Christ is absolutely necessary to salvation naturally requires probation after death for all pagans and infants in order to vindicate the justice of God. Such a probation is not taught in the Holy Scriptures, nor is it needed in our Wesleyan theology."—Daniel Steele.

Let me give you an illustration of your change of relation to inbred sin. Supposing a father or mother by reckless exposure brings on consumption; children are

born to them; they soon exhibit signs of this dreaded disease, look pale, cough, and grow thin. Now they are not to blame for inheriting the consumption. But listen! If a remedy were offered them, and if the remedy had cured thousands of cases just like theirs, and was never known to fail, and if the physician understood the case perfectly, and the remedy perfectly, and his practice had been very extensive; then, if the remedy were refused by the consumptive, would not the patient be responsible for retaining the consumption any longer and would not his death be negative suicide?

Jesus is the Great Physician.

1. Understands the disease.
2. Understands the patient.
3. Understands the cause of disease.
4. Understands the importance of a cure.
5. Understands the difficulties in the way.
6. Understands the true method of cure.
7. Needs no consulting physician.
8. Makes no mistakes.
9. Never neglects a patient.
10. His prescriptions are infallible.
11. When He cures, the patient knows it.
12. He makes no charges.

I'm glad salvation's free! God blames Adam for inbred sin. Rom. 5: 12, "By one man sin entered into the world."

A clean heart in the light of conversion is one that has been cleansed from all responsible sins and sinful stains. A perfectly clean heart is one which has been cleansed from inbred sin, also, for there is the washing of regeneration, which is not the washing of entire sanctification.

Inbred sin is never discovered and identified until some time after a clear conversion. There is no basis of antagonism morally until after the new life of regeneration exists. It is not then the conviction for sins, but the discovery of an existing state.

It is uncovered and revealed by the new birth. I have never known or seen, or read of any one being cleansed from inbred sin when he was converted.

The Mobile *Register* says: "Recently a fifty-six-inch circular saw at a mill in Mobile, running 800 revolutions per minute, struck something in a pine log and flew into pieces.

"The engine was stopped, and an examination of the log showed that the saw had struck a six-inch iron shell in the tree, cutting off enough to show the powder inside. The slab and one plank had been sawed off, and this was the third cut, showing how deep the shell was imbedded. The log was cut from the land in the vicinity of Spanish fort, and it is believed that this shell was fired into the tree during the terrific bombardment of that place during the late war." I was present at the time of the terrible battle here referred to, and know of the firing of

the missiles named, and think it illustrates the point I have just made. Under the steady, smooth running of conversion many suddenly come upon the imbedded moral opposite and there is an explosion.

All went well in cutting off one slab and a plank, and if no more work had been done the laborer might have disputed the existence of the shell, but when he had worked to a sufficient depth he struck it.

All converted people will strike inbred sin if they work deep enough into their own soul.

I have read that scientists discover enough electricity in an acre of fog to destroy all the animal life in that acre, but *it is unknown except to their experiments.* Inbred sin is only known under the experience of sound conversion. With an experience of twenty-three years and making special observations on this subject during that period, I am ready to state that no soundly converted person can maintain his converted state six months without discovering its existence and deploring its presence and activity, and even having times when he earnestly prays for help from God on this account.

Weeks or months may elapse after conversion before its presence is felt. For lack of definite teaching from the pulpit, and the pew, many go on for years with this trouble, not knowing what to call it, nor how to be permanently rid of it. I have met scores of church members in this predicament, who, when they accepted the

teaching and complied with the conditions, were instantaneously cleansed and filled with power from on high.

The real nature of sin is not seen until you cease its practice and try to control it. I do not mean now its moral character. When you try to chain it you will feel and know its vicious nature, and never before.

The Holy Ghost in the light of conversion reveals inbred sin, and then reveals Jesus and the cleansing fountain, and if we cry, apply it! apply it! He will.

The devil does not desire you to name it sin, nor sinfulness, for he expects Jesus to come and destroy it when you do. Some of the symptoms of its operation I have observed as follows:

That you do not feel it as some do does not prove that you are without it. No matter what you claim; if you have never had it cleansed away you have it still, and it manifests itself in some way. Its behavior depends upon circumstances. In some it prompts stinginess; in others secret willfulness when none is seen; secret dislike of holiness (to resist and hate holiness preaching is one chief proof that you have it), bad temper, lack of faith, doubts and fears, failure to touch power in prayer, shutting your eyes when you testify, covering your face with a book or handkerchief when you pray, rising of envy and jealousy, feeling of revenge, searching for passages to disprove it, uneasy when the doctrine

is preached, refusing to rise on a test, ready to argue against it, ridiculing holiness meetings, afraid you will profess too much, unwilling to let any one locate and name it, seen some one who didn't live it, not going to the altar, have settled it in your mind, thinking it is conceit in those who profess holiness, some smart ministers take opposite views from you, it's only for the ministers and missionaries, you will neither rise on a test that you are a sinner or a saint in a holiness meeting. Another one says under the prompting, "I am afraid it will divide the church," etc. Let me say this right here, that no one can prove that the preaching of holiness ever divided any church; *it develops an existing division.*

I was present in a village once when a severe wind storm blew down what had previously appeared to be a nice, large and healthy maple tree, but I discovered that the heart of the prostrate tree was black and unsound. Did the wind produce the decayed heart condition of the tree? No! it disclosed the diseased internal, which already existed, and had existed for a long time. So the preaching of the doctrine of inbred sin, and need of entire holiness, uncovers the true state of many hearts, and they are tempted by the devil to resist the doctrine and the preacher, and it leads many to say it's only a difference of doctrines and methods. Dear friend, you are very much mistaken; it is a difference of personal experience. I never knew any one to oppose this who had

the experience. It generally comes from those who have never tried (properly) to obtain it. I have proven Mr. Wesley's statement to be true, in a fifteen years' pastorate, preaching the doctrine he here refers to, everywhere I have been, and I do not believe it has been disproven in the experience of any other preacher for the past one hundred and sixteen years. It is as follows:

To Miss Ritchie, 1782: "That point, *entire salvation from inbred sin,* can hardly ever be insisted upon, either in preaching or prayer, without a particular blessing." Vol. 7, p. 181.

I have heard the following expressions:

I am afraid I shall profess too much.

I am afraid I cannot hold out.

Have seen some spurious ones.

You are unwilling to have me locate it.

I am not going to the altar every night. I have settled it my mind.

I said it was conceit in those who professed it.

I thought it only for the minister, his wife or for missionaries.

Some smart preachers, editors, bishops, etc., don't believe it as you do.

Yes, and they do not get it as we do, either. Mark that down, my friend.

And no one who hears them preach gets it, either;

that is an historical fact that I have confirmed from personal testimony for the past twenty-one years.

"As it would be a fatal error for a parent to grant a request from a disobedient child, that would only be proper to grant to an obedient one, so to grant to those who refuse cleansing from inbred sin such a moral purity would put those at ease who ought to be disturbed. And such action would introduce discord into the harmonies of the spiritual universe."—Baker.

Dr. Buckley demolishes Huntington's denial of the existence of this sinful element in a very incisive and shrewd way by showing historically its universal existence in all humanity after conversion.

Huntington's phrase, "Is not our sin," is an old man of straw, and many times thrashed over at that. It is so old it has become musty.

The contention of Wesleyan Methodism and the Bible is that there is moral quality in it before the will consents, but no guilt until the will consents. The nature of the thing is sinful, it is immoral. Consciousness of this evil may exist and at the same time no sense of sin, and no feeling of guilt for its existence.

"The sense of sin is consequent upon the apprehension of Almighty God."

How can inbred sin be called "*our old man*" which is upon us by unavoidable inheritance?

1. It is called ours because it is operative in us and out through our peculiar make-up.

2. It is not ours in the sense that its existence in us was the result of our own acts.

3. Neither are the collateral results on the mind and body of Adam's fall ours in the sense that we produced them. (I mean infirmities of mind and body.)

4. An imperfect and weak body, an inherited appetite for tobacco, rum, lust or inherited scrofula, can be accounted for by the laws of physical heredity. These are the results of the sins of immediate human progenitors.

The mind may also become weakened by the same laws.

5. But the something in the human nature that produces and brings into being so quickly in converted people, at times under certain conditions, without any willing at all, and contrary to human willing, something like a feeling of jealousy, envy, pride, etc., in the sensibilities, the very lowest sensibilities, in a psychological sense, and which, in spite of the preventing grace of conversion, sometimes becomes operative outside, and is always felt inside when the conditions are right. THAT IS IN-BRED SIN!!!

When these uprisings make a determining impression upon your mind, and you decide to act upon them when

an opportunity presents, then you have actually sinned and have become a sinner and must repent.

When felt and not yielded to, they produce regret, but not guilt.

Dr. Steele says that nearly the whole Christian world from Jerome to Wesley believed in the guilt of original sin. If we read Rom. 5: 12 correctly we shall discover that no one is guilty for original sin inherited, for it reads, "In whom we all have sinned," instead of "For that all have sinned."

"Sin is universal on the earth. Only one of the human family dares stand up and say 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' (R. V.); 'I always do those things that please Him.' 'The prince of this world * * * hath nothing in me?' Now, if we are born equally poised between holiness and sin, it would be natural to expect at least as many to develop holiness as to commit sin. But we find but one out of the countless millions untouched by this moral leprosy and he was supernaturally born. It is unscientific to say that environment and eaxmple induced sin in every case. This is an inadequate cause. The brothers and sisters of Jesus had the same environment. Why were they not sinless? If a stream is found to be impure all the way up to the fountain, it is scientific to say that the fountain is itself impure."—*Rev. Daniel Steele.*

CHAPTER VI.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN A SINFUL STATE AND A SINFUL ACT.

This sin must also be distinguished from added sin. That is, what was in you at birth, and what you have added since by your own sinful conduct. Adam was depraved by being deprived of the holy life within.

Some may say, Why do you call it sin, and then say it exists at first, independent of our volition or will? Because it is of the nature of sin, unholy, the very root of all sins. The fruit is sinful, the tree must be sin.

Paul says it is sin that *dwells* in me, and in spite of his will it was active.

John speaks of it in I. John 1: 8 as the *sin* that deceives, and any one can see that the will is not involved.

This is contrasted with past sinning which does involve the will as in I. John 1: 10.

Again I call it sin, because every Christian man's conscience condemns it, and resists its promptings of pride, envy, bad temper, as contrary to holiness, and because *it must be sin,* because the blood of Christ is required to remove it.

There can be no sin in act except there be some sin in being within yourself to prompt it.

There must be a state of anger before there can be an angry act.

You ask how could it be so with Adam and Eve, who

were created holy? I reply: It was at first a thought of an evil injected into their minds. They entertained it long enough to make a determining impression upon their wills by producing a pleasing emotion in the realm of their sensibilities, and thus the seed of sin was sown in their hearts before they decided to act, and this is what prompted their action.

And this is the way all our young and old people are prompted to sin to this day.

They wish to know more about some things, and so they seek an experimental acquaintance with sin, when God only intended that Adam, and everybody else, should only know sin by theory, or an abstract statement of it, and believe God that the things prohibited were only harmful, and never experience the injury of sinning.

Hence whoever assents to and practices gambling or dancing, or billiards, etc., in the home to prevent the practice by children in the questionable places of public resort, is violating a Divine precept given in the garden of Eden, and incorporated in every law God has made ever since for the moral government of his creatures.

One might as well say and practice what he says, "I will teach my daughter the sin of harlotry, to prevent her being a sinner along this line, by allowing her to live in a house of ill fame for a few weeks, by having a lot of professional harlots come to my home to practice their deeds of shame."

No, God says that some things are wrong and asks you to believe his word and totally refrain from ever knowing what these sinful pleasures are by experience. The practice of the sins that the word of God describes is sinful conduct and will endanger the guilty parties.

Let me use a familiar illustration. Have you ever been to the Hathorn Spring in Saratoga? We walk into the spacious apartments and the first object that meets our eyes is the tall glass tube inside the brass railing. How beautifully the water rises to the height of the tube.

How it sparkles and bubbles as if by some unseen hand it were thrown into its transparent enclosure.

Then look at the smaller receptacle.

How it boils and runs over the top. We turn away and go out on the street and meet an acquaintance and say to him, "I have seen the Hathorn Spring." So you did, but only the active external. The source and cause of that boiling and bubbling you did not see. Except for the invisible cause there could be no visible activity.

What you did see may illustrate actual sinning or sins, and what you did not, and could not see, although it existed, may stand for inbred sin.

James 3: 14, 18 describes the relation of this sinful state to sinful acts as follows:

"But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth.

"This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.

"For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.

"But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy.

"And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace."

In Rom. 8: 7 Paul is contrasting a natural man with a spiritual man. One minds carnality, and that is an evidence of spiritual death. The other one minds or obeys the Spirit, and that is an evidence of spiritual life.

The "Babes in Christ" in I. Cor. 3 were not carnally minded, but carnal. That is not dominated by carnality. It existed but did not rule at all times, but had occasional outbreaks to denote its existence.

A regenerated person is carnal, but not completely dominated by it as the unregenerated are at all times. Hence there is a sense in which the carnal mind is yourself wholly, and that is when the carnal mind operates in and out of you unrestrained by the existence of a complete conversion.

This is what is meant by Rom. 8: 6, "To be carnally minded is death." Dead is trespasses and sins. So to be carnal, and not carnally minded, means not as carnal as the unconverted, and not as spiritual as the entirely sancti-

fied. Hence he must address them as partly carnal and partly spiritual. By that statement is meant sufficiently spiritual to be in a perfectly justified state, with the resident, and irresponsible state of inbred sin in the heart.

Paul also relates the sinful state with the sinful act in Rom. 7: 16, 17, Literal Greek. "Now then no longer am I working it out (this practice), but the sin dwelling in me." (The me as distinguished from the my). "But if what I do not will, this I practice, I consent to the law that it is right." (Yes, he says it is right, but I cannot do it.)

Daniel Steele has beautifully adjusted this relation to the converted life in an utterance that ought to be handed down from one generation to another as long as the world stands.

"Character is never predicated from a tendency under control, but rather from that inner principle which habitually dominates the conduct."

Let us now relate this sinful state to some conduct that relates to delicate matters, in the realm of the natural appetites and passions.

A correct exegesis of Rom. 6: 6 will enable us to see this relation as to our bodily functions and appetite. I will give a literal reading as that is plainer: "This knowing that our old man, or the old man of us all (carnality common to the race), was crucified with (Him) (provisionally, which provided for the reality). In order that

the body of sin (that is, the organic body ruled by sin) might become inoperative, (that is, carnality could no longer operate it, nor through it). In order that we (our complex structure, as a whole, the faculties and functions of mind and body) NO LONGER BE A SLAVE TO THIS SIN."

The verb rendered "Destroy" in Rom. 6: 6 means, "To render useless" and does not therefore mean that anything is destroyed, that is that any sin is destroyed.

Katargeo rendered "Destroyed" in the common version is not the correct translation to convey the meaning. For it means that the physical body is no longer operated by the "Old Man" who was crucified, and thus eradicated from the being, not for the purpose of killing the body (the organic body ruled by the old man), but, being entirely out of the body it, the body, is no longer operated in any degree by this old man of sin.

The old body still survives the circumcision of the old man. But now with a new enthroned divine person to rule without a rival.

THE CRYING NEED OF THE WORLD TODAY IS THE REVELATION OF, AND THE CURE OF, ITS CARNALITY.

The same thing is taught in Rom. 8:13 (Lit. Greek) "For if according to flesh (carnal) ye live, ye are about to die off. But if by the Spirit, the practices of the body (sinful acts and propensities) ye cease, or put to death,

ye will live." (That is live a holy life.) The verb "Thanato-o" rendered "Mortify" means to "Subdue," when it refers to the physical appetencies and passions.

Now this leads us to something more definite and intricate. As to the matter of the legitimate functions and their perversion.

We must not think that whatever appeals to the sensuous, in holy persons, is sinful. This may be a temptation of the devil, and grieve us through ignorance. God gave us our five senses to enjoy and glorify him, and the holy life within is a preventive of the perversion of things they reveal to us.

To gratify these demands where no law is violated does not prove the existence of the carnal principle, for that is not subject to the law of God or man either.

No man or woman, nor any boy or girl, is safe with the carnal remains residing within ready to spring into activity upon some provocation. It is subtle and crafty and deceptive.

It exists back of, and rises up in spite of, the will. It never consults the volition.

In I. Cor. 9: 27 the passage of Paul which says, "I keep my body under," is neither *sarx,* nor *sarkinos,* but *soma,* bodily functions, or body. The physical, bodily appurtenances only are here referred to. It is the personal self that gets the "Black Eye" and is thus under.

I give the thoughts and language of another that I

most heartily endorse. Read carefully and thoughtfully and prayerfully:

"At the outset it will be conceded that there is a wide difference between our volitions on one hand and our desires and wishes on the other. The interesting, but puzzling question then arises, may there not be a moral quality in those wishes and desires? May there not be lustful desires without the decision or determination of the will to act? May there not be unholy wishes and aspirations that do not embrace the volitional element? I respond to these questions in the affirmative.

If we know the object to be forbidden and still wish it, desire it and are prevented only by certain prudential considerations from determining upon the acquisition of it, the act is undoubtedly sinful. I cannot but regard the view which limits sin to the volitions as a grave mistake. If it be correct there is no such a thing as the sin of concupiscence and the old theological controversy over this head is but a mere war of words.

"There are multitudes who cherish unholy wishes and mentally indulge in lewd thoughts who have not exercised the executive power of the will which is a necessary step toward the gratification of their passions. Our Lord perceived this great, ethical truth that I am seeking to express when he said, 'Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her has committed adultery with her already in

his heart.' All children of God hate sin and desire its banishment from the world. Are not such desires holy?

"It is true that desires and wishes, *per se,* are neither virtuous nor vicious. They take on a moral character at the point where the conscience interposes. If it declares the object wished, to be sinful, we incur guilt when we consent to the continuance of the desire. It is when the will overrides the prohibitions of conscience that sin is conceived and brought forth. But this consent be it observed, is not a volition. The former is a passive and the latter an active state of the will.

"In the interest of clear thought and sound doctrine this distinction between desire and volition must be kept steadily in view. Desire is a craving for an object in view of appropriating it to the use of self; but the decision to act in reference to it is a volition. The object of desire is something considered as good. The object of volition is the executive act consequent upon the volition. Desires are passively determined by something foreign to self considered as a good. Volitions are determined intentionally by the will itself, usually, in view of motives. Desires are phenomena of the sensibility and do not necessarily eventuate in action. Volitions are sovereign acts of the will determining executive actions."

The practical significance of this distinction is that the province of sin is widened, but widened no further than the sphere of human freedom and responsibility.

Man's will, the center and essence of his personality, blends with all his deeds, words, thoughts and secret purposes of his heart. The fatal defect of the theory here reviewed is that it makes no provisions for the sin of concupiscence—a sin clearly recognized in Scripture and which scientific ethics shows may not issue in a volition.

Whedon on Matt. 5: 28 says, "Not every glance of admiration cast upon the beauty of the opposite sex is here condemned. Such a faculty to perceive beauty and deformity was planted in our nature for pure and beneficial purposes. Not even the superior attractions of another man's wife, or another woman's husband is transgression."

But when God's kind of love is in the heart it prevents the change from an innocent sentiment to a dangerous sensation.

It takes the union of the will with the suggestion of an evil, which only an opportunity to accomplish it prevents, to bring forth sin, that produces guilt, without an act.

A thought of an evil, that is not an evil thought, thrust momentarily into an unwilling mind and repelled is not in the Bible sense an evil thought, but many have been tempted to think it was and have cast away their confidence and made shipwreck where no rocks were, but simply abandoned the vessel to the mercy of the waves.

There is no such thing as the sanctification of the mind to make such suggestions of the devil impossible.

We shall be open to good and bad influences all our lifetime, and no state of grace will, or can prevent it, but bless God full salvation, obtained and retained will give us constant victory every day of our life with no defeats. See Wesley's sermon on wandering thoughts.

Let us hear from the hero of a thousand battles, and from the man to whom I listened with all attention at Round Lake when I went down into the straw and was sanctified wholly. I mean Wm. Taylor. God bless his memory!!!!!

"The simple instincts are not under the direct control of the will, and hence not essentially changed by the work of the Holy Sanctifier in the heart. The appetites and passions growing out of those instincts, do come within the power of the will, and hence must be controlled and kept in harmony with one conscientious standard of righteousness. When an appeal is made by Satan, or by any other agency, to any instinct of my nature, the first conscious instinctive emotion is not a moral action, for it is outside the province of the will. The appeal is indeed made to the will, through the persuasive medium of the instinct, and now I must meet it promptly at the very threshold of the citadel of my moral nature, and inquire —First, Is it right? If I conscientiously settle the question in the affirmative, then I thank God for affording

me this source and means of enjoyment. Second, How far is this right?—for lawful gratifications may be carried to an unlawful extent, and hence become sinful. I then fix the line, and say to appetite or passion, So far shalt thou go and no further. A mistake in judgment need not effect the purity of the heart; but the purity of the heart, on the other hand, will not exempt us from the legitimate penalties of other laws, other than the moral law of my conscience, which may be broken through that mistake."

CHAPTER VII.

HOW IS THIS STATE OF SINFULNESS REMOVED?

It is never to be pardoned. Hence it was not removed at conversion. It is not the result of my transgressions, but born in me.

Hence, it does not and cannot affect my justification.

It cannot be pardoned like my actual sins, and the words pardon and forgive are never used in relation to it in the Bible.

It clings to my soul. It cannot be lived out, or educated out, or removed by any act of mine. It imperils me every moment it lives in me.

The baby shows it when it sends its little tin plate skipping across the table because you didn't pass the tarts first. You spanked it, but you didn't spank inbred sin out.

People sometimes try to patch it up, like the man who painted his pumphandle vermilion red because the water in the well made him sick.

No, its removal must be preceded by a confession of its existence and real character, and by special prayer by faith for its *cleansing,* not pardon. The words in the New Testament that refer to the removal of this sin are cleanse, kill, purge, crucify, wash and never pardon, for-

give, nor growth, nor death, nor purgatory, but cleansing now, instantaneously, in the blood of Jesus.

Dear reader, listen! you cannot find a single testimony anywhere, from dead or living witnesses, or any passage in the whole Bible, to the cleansing from inbred sin, by education, growth or death. Death and purgatory cleansing from sin can never be proven by a single living witness. Do you see?

I have known and heard hundreds testify (whose word could not be impeached in any court in the land) to the cleansing from inbred sin, as a distinct work subsequent to conversion.

Which will you receive—a statement that never was, and that never can be proven, this side of eternity, or one which has had, and does still have hundreds of living witnesses? John Wesley's statement has never been overthrown: "If you are looking for this salvation in any other way than by simple *faith now,* you are looking for it by works."

The Bible plainly teaches us the twofold nature of sin, and the two successive acts by which it is all removed.

"If we confess *our* sins he is faithful and just to forgive *us our* sins and to cleanse us from *all* unrighteous."

The two verbs in this text, forgive and cleanse, are in the aorist tense, signifying a sudden, completed act. It can be returned to the heart as it entered Adam's heart in the first place. The thought entered his mind of violat-

ing law. It descended and contaminated his affections. The seed was thus sown in his heart. This, then, is the course it can take with you. It then becomes sin responsibly assumed. So you can be tempted, but you need not yield; you can fall, but you need not; you can sin, but you need not. Pope, Vol. 3, "The principle of sin, extinct in the soul, may be kindled into life as it was in Eve." See also I. Tim. 1: 19.

Dear reader, I trust it has been made clear to you. Now, ask for the cleansing! Do not delay! Only consult God! Look up where you are! Cleanse me now! If you have any sins to confess and be pardoned for, you must confess and be pardoned first. If you have any condemnation you are not justified, for no one in Christ Jesus has any condemnation. God help you now! Eternity may dawn suddenly! and remember, no kind or degree of sin can enter heaven.

The destruction of this carnal principle by appropriating the provisions of the atonement, according to Rom. 6: 6, is the only remedy, and this destructive act of God does neither arrange, nor re-arrange, nor derange the human structure as the Divine hand formed it.

Then when this blessed work is done the carnal self no longer seizes the physical and infirm self-hood, and go galloping into all unholy extremes, for the carnal self is that which corrupts our proper self-hood, and this ac-

counts for the perversion of the legal functions of body and mind.

Hence I. Thess. 4: 3 teaches the necessity of being made holy in order to keep from sinning through the body as the instrument or agent.

A knowledge of these principles, with a morally clean heart, will prevent impatience with our own, or the infirmities of others, and save us from arbitrarily excluding or suppressing them.

We must thus discriminate, inasmuch as the scriptures do, and not class them all as one, and then say, we can never be rid of self as long as we are in the body. What self do you mean when you make that statement?

Paul rising to the height of holy fervor in his soul, and summoning to his aid the Greek usage of verbs and phrases shouts out (Heb. 6: 1), Be borne onward (The verb Phero, never means to go on) to this Christian perfection, "Cease being babes!" (*Adam Clarke.*)

Stop sinning, and repenting, by ceasing to lay the foundation for such conduct.

Abandon such principles as necessitate the constant conduct of any believers such as sinners ought to practice.

Carnality, or babyishness, pleads and apologizes for sin by inculcating false principles, for it is impossible to make it co-operative for any good. Nor can it ever be in partnership with God. In any form it is an usurper.

"God never made sin a fact, nor set anything in the universe to harmonize with it." Bushnell.

Hence the carnal mind must be, and can be, destroyed, by reason of the provision and by decree, and this destruction may be known by experience. Rom. 6: 6.

"Knowing this, our old man was crucified."

There is as much force in the use of the present tense in the verb "'Serve" as in the use of the aorist tense in the verb "destroy," for it proclaims a paean of triumph as follows: In order that you may not serve sin all the time, or any time at all.

One writer has said: "It is the work of the Spirit in the new birth to impart spiritual life which resists this racial tendency toward sin till its complete extermination in the Spirit's work of entire sanctification. Then the gravitation of the soul is changed from downward to upward. All truly regenerated persons aspire to this experience, although through prejudice engendered by misleaders, they may reject the terms with which it is defined as holiness, perfection and perfect love."

There can be no such thing as getting rid of sin (as to its real cause) by piecemeal, by a succession of cleansings, such as pride to-day, lust next day, sinful anger next day, lying next day, etc.

You cannot cure the diseased heart of a tree by cutting off the diseased fruit or diseased branches.

When any part of inbred sin goes, it must all depart

at once. Whoever has inbred sin has the possibility of all sins.

An American exegete writes as follows: "Many good people cling to the doleful doctrine that sin is necessary to this present life and that it must continue till physical death in the case of the normal Christian, and that a perfectly holy man is something abnormal. The Bible teaches that Christ came into the world to destroy the works of the devil. Sin is the devil's masterpiece which the Lamb of God came into the world provisionally to destroy through the efficacy of faith in his blood. He has opened a fountain for sin and all uncleanness, not in the article of death or after our last heart-beat. Paul certainly contemplated a period of life after dying unto sin once for all, when in answer to our question, in a slightly changed form, he queried thus: 'We who died to sin, how shall we live any longer therein?' It is not a process, 'are dying,' but a completed act, 'died.' Strictly speaking, there are no degrees of death, although we hear men in the street using this phrase, 'deader than Julius Caesar.' Crucifixion, Paul's favorite word for the cessation of the self-centered life, is a decisive act admitting of no degrees, or 'dying deeper down,' 'our old man was crucified' (aorist) subsequently explained by Paul's reference to his own experience in Gal. 2: 20, 'I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer that I live' (American Revision). He did

not need to die deeper down. The fact that he kept his body under by holding in check his innocent animal appetites, like those of Jesus Christ, does not prove the need of a deeper death in the one case any more than in the other."

These statements can never be disproven by the Bible. They are true to all experience. Thank God for these facts.

Hence Paul exhorts the Ephesian Church in Chap. 4: 14, Not to be childish, nor babyish, Not that any state of grace is to be repudiated for any other, not that our adoption as children is ever to be done away with. No! not our childhood, but our childish state, our babyish state, is to be exchanged for a Christian manhood and womanhood.

And this is what Paul is referring to when he says in Eph. 4: 14, "That we henceforth be no more children, (babyish) tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine (or doctrine of wind) by the sleight of men."

This proves a transition, suddenly, not as in nature, but as in grace, from the spiritual babyhood to the spiritual manhood.

Hallelujah! Cannot God kill all his enemies? Well the "carnal mind is enmity against God."

Is this carnality the work of the devil? Certainly it is and the Bible plainly so declares. Well, bless the Lord!

Jesus Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the devil. Now let Him do it!!!!

The verb "Stauro, o" puts the Old Man to death, in Rom. 6:6, and when the prefix is put on it becomes "Sus-tauro, o," "to crucify with." And that teaches us that ample provision has been made for his eradication completely through our appropriation of the blood atonement, expressed by the aoriest tense in Rom. 6: 6. Was crucified, once for all, and bless God, for all, provisionally. So that the actual, and real crucifixion might take place in each heart, when the subject will consent to appropriate the benefits of such Divine provision.

We are not only required to be a "Holy Temple," I. Cor. 3: 17, but we are required to be all holy, I. Cor. 5: 7, "Purge out the old leaven that ye may be a new lump."

God removes no natural endowment. He requires its control, and needs its service in this world to promote His kingdom.

I give you three questions and their answers on this point and at this time that I think answers certain questions very correctly.

After a person is wholly sanctified, when tempted to anger or jealousy, will he have any inward struggle against it?

Ans. His whole being will resist the commission of sin. But perhaps the query of the questioner is whether,

in the presence of either of these temptations, there will be developed in this person a dualism, a part of his nature inclining towards indulgence, and another part resisting it. (To this we reply that if indulgence is perceived to be a sin per se, independent of circumstances and motives, there can be in a soul entirely sanctified no such dualism.) But some acts are of doubtful moral character. Anger may be bad and it may be good. "God is angry with the wicked every day." His Son Jesus Christ, when under a mean and culpable espionage respecting healing on the Sabbath, looked "with anger" upon these hypocritical spies, "being grieved for the hardness of their hearts."

How can a person be at peace with God (Rom. 5: 1), have the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him and at the same time have the carnal mind which Paul says is enmity to God? Is not the carnal mind destroyed, crucified in regeneration?

Ans. The first question we answer negatively. The carnal mind and the spiritual life cannot co-exist. The Greek is best rendered by Bengel, "the minding of the flesh," i. e., the dominance of depraved inclination is death, spiritual and eternal. *But the existence of such inclination under the control of the new, spiritual life aspiring to the complete elimination of evil tendencies is quite a different thing.* It is the experience of a ma-

jority of regenerate souls, to whom "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit strives against the flesh in order that they may not do the things which they would" (Gal. 5: 17, R. V.). They have not advanced to verse 24, where Christians at their climax on the earth are described as having crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts. The Corinthians were in the same mixed condition. They were "babes in Christ," and yet so carnal that Paul hesitates to call them spiritual, though styled "brethren," in the opening address of his first epistle, and "sanctified" provisionally. The same concrete character, good and evil, with good in the ascendency, is implied (I. Cor. 7: 1), by the chaptering violently divorced from its connection with 6: 18, "Having therefore these promises," or things promised, namely, that we should be sons and daughters, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness. Here is as plain as the noonday sun that the children of God may be imperfect in holiness.

Please define self-crucifixion.

Ans. Many people regard any interest in their own well-being as inconsistent with a state of perfected holiness. They confound self-love with selfishness. This is the error of Faber in his poem entitled "Self-Love:"

"Alas! no speed of life can snatch us wholly
Out of self's hateful sight;

And it keeps step, whene'er we travel slowly,
And sleeps with us at night."

This poet sorrowfully and despairingly insists that the grace of God has no cure of self this side of the grave, that the only effectual remedy is Oliver Wendell Holmes' cure of hay fever—seven feet of gravel. Says Faber:

"The opiate balms of grace may haply still thee
Deep in my nature lying;
For I may hardly hope, alas! to kill thee,
Save by the act of dying."

The self to be crucified is the self which is a rival to Christ. The self which God approves and we ought not to condemn is the self which bears the image of his Son. This is what Paul means when he says, through the Am. Revision, "I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."

Faber wrote the above poem as descriptive of his own experience, and consistent with the theology he had embraced, but this is not and never was the experience of an entirely sanctified person.

The physical body was never intended to be against the holy life, by our Creator, for it is the residence of the Holy Spirit.

God in Christ was in such a body. Our bodies are included in the acceptable sacrifice that they may be sanctified and be preserved blameless.

Holy men of God lived in such bodies, and pleased God many years and walked with Him.

The term "Vile Body" reads "Body of our humiliation."

Through the physical senses the body becomes a danger to the soul. For these are the avenues through which the tempter reaches the heart.

Is God able to save us to the uttermost of our need, and the uttermost of time, and to the uttermost of eternity? Hallelujah! "Wherefore He is able."

The seat of sin is not in our natural faculties, because none of them in the abstract as God gave them to us, are sinful, hence we can keep this body, and glorify God here with it when all sin is out.

The effect of our faculty activities, be they right or wrong, must not be mistaken for the cause.

There is a natural or physical self, God given, and related to us as it is for his glory while we are in this world.

And that clinging to this is an infirmity, of mind and body, as the result of the fall in a collateral way. I call this an infirm self within this natural physical self. II. Cor. 12: 9.

And we shall have both the natural and infirm self as long as we live in this body, and through which God can be glorified.

But the carnal self, or the carnal mind, the disturber

of the peace, and the aggravator of the physical and infirm self, and which is the cause of the wicked perversion of this physical self, and infirm self, may be removed root and branch, instantaneously, by the appropriation of the provisions of the atonement in Jesus Christ.

The physical self is not the carnal self and the Bible plainly says so. The carnal mind, or inbred sin, is the sin of the world, but thank God John said, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

The human personal self is not the sin principle, it is not the "Sarx" nor the "Soma" carnality, nor the body.

Therefore we must never think that holiness consists in the destruction of the body, nor any portion thereof by either, any process of starvation, or self inflicted torture, or any surgical operation, or at, or by death.

John wrote, I. John 1: 2, that Jesus had a physical body as regular as our own, and that he proved it to be so by three of his physical senses, namely, Sight, Touch, Hearing, and that inside of this body resided the holy life of God, and through which body it manifested itself to the outside world, and that he and the other apostles had the same life, and that he wrote his letter that others might come into the same blessed experience.

For he said, "Truly our fellowship (partaker in common with another) is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ."

tians, preventing the acceptance of the pentecostal baptism, which is the only preparatory condition for either promoting or conserving a true spiritual revival.

We shall never convince this world of its obligation to accept Christ until the church comes into this complete spiritual oneness with the Holy Ghost.

The mind of Christ was free from the carnal mind. It was a lowly mind. An unworldly mind. A perfectly resigned mind. It was a sympathetic mind. It was a soul saving mind. It was a sanctified mind. HAVE YOU THE MIND OF CHRIST?

A hunter in the Alleghenies one day shot a large bald eagle. The bird measured seven feet two inches across the wing. When the sportsman went to examine his prize he was astonished to find one of the eagle's claws held firmly in a powerful steel trap to which was attached a steel chain five feet long. Trap and chain had many marks of vicious blows from the eagle's bill, showing how he had vainly endeavored to free himself from them. While they had not been heavy enough to prevent his flying, the hunter believed that they so impeded and wearied him as to be the cause of bringing the great bird within the reach of his rifle.

Many a fine man with brain and imagination and heart capable of high, soaring flight has been brought within reach of the enemy's gun by some trap of vicious appetite or passion that has held him down from his place

among the stars. How wise the admonition of Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews: "Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us."—*Dr. Banks, in Homiletic Review.*

"Even though we had no expressed command, we would be bound to realize the highest ideal. This is found in the character of Jesus Christ. (While a better is in sight, we can rest in no good; and the refusal to move onward is to be a traitor to the highest, and so, finally, to the good itself) says Dr. Borden P. Bowne. Indifference in sight of spiritual perfection is a perilous attitude of a free moral agent professing faith in Christ."

The direct Scripture bearing upon its eradication may be cited as follows: In Rom. 6: 6, Instantaneous death of the "Old Man" by the figure of the mode of capital punishment at that time, by which it was intended that a person's physical life was not merely suspended nor suppressed, but permanently ended, as was the case with our Savior and the two thieves who were crucified with Him.

I. Peter 1: 15, 16, Here instantaneous and perfect holiness by command is held to be possible, practical and eternal.

II. Cor. 7: 1, Where the child of God is to be perfectly and quickly cleansed and thus perfecting holiness begun in conversion.

Gal. 5: 17, Where the mixed state is described, and

315459

in the 24th verse, where the perfect cleansing from all carnality is stated as for the Christian here and now.

And in I. Thess. 5: 23, Where believers are to be instantaneously and perfectly cleansed in entire sanctification and preserved in that spiritual state to the end of time, and where it is stated that the fidelity of God is pledged to do the work.

Col. 2: 11, Where Paul says we may put off the body of the carnal at once and permanently.

And in Col. 3: 9, "Old Man" may be put down, out, and off, as the verb with a double prefix indicates. Apo. (away from), Ek. (out of), Duo. or Do (sun down or down). Hence the perfect eradication of the "Old Man" in the use of this compound verb as follows: Down, Out, Off. Hallelujah!

CHAPTER VIII.

MUST WE COMMIT SIN?

Now we are ready to ask and answer Paul's question as follows:

We often hear it said: "You cannot live without sinning." Well, I say you can live much better without it than you can with it.

I will now proceed to prove from the New Testament that we are expected to cease all acts of sin as soon as the Christian life begins in the soul.

Jesus so taught at John 5: 14, "Sin no more." This was said after the Lord had cured the man at the pool at Bethesda.

The Master said, I have now wrought a perfect cure upon you and behold you are whole, now go on from this time and commit no more sin.

Now if this was not possible, then Jesus commanded an impossibility, and therefore He was a hard master demanding beyond the ability to perform.

Jesus so taught also in John 8: 11, "Go and sin no more." This was said to the woman taken in adultery. As though in the present time, a woman should be converted from the modern Brothel after confessing her sins and receiving pardon from Jesus, the teaching of our Lord is that she must and therefore can from that moment begin a life without sinning.

Forgiveness has relation to the past, and its history can never be affaced, no not even in heaven (for they sing up there, and so will we "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood on the tree"). See also Rev. 7: 14, but thank God the guilt will be entirely removed, for the past sins, but they need never be repeated.

Rom. 6: 1, 2, "Shall we continue in sin?" and the reply is "God forbid." This reply as here printed might convey a wrong idea, because the literal language only contains the notion of a simple prohibition, God prohibits you from so doing; no, this is not the teaching of this passage. The Greek words are, "Ma Genoito," do not begin it. It may not be. You need not sin. It is not necessary. Shall we continue the sin business? Paul replies, no! you need not. Bless the Lord! we have something better to do than to commit sin; we can pray, and shout, and sing, and shine, and win souls to Jesus. Hallelujah! Jesus said (although He knew, and everybody knows, that sinning is possible, yet it is not necessary, because it is possible. No one is compelled to sin). "Go and sin no more" and praise the Lord, with His help we can keep that commandment.

I. John 2: 1, "My little children, these things I am now writing (Greek Present Tense) to you, in order that ye may not sin (at all, Aor. tense) and if any one should sin, (not that they must, nor do sin) a paraclete

we have with the Father, (Paraclete, is literally, a lawyer for the defense) Jesus Christ (the) righteous, and he the propitiation is for our sins. (That is, all Christians who happen to sin) and not for ours only (in particular), but also for the whole world" (of unsaved).

John wrote these words to inform them that they need not sin at all.

I. John 3: 9, "Not any one (Lit. everyone) that has been begotten of God (and so remains, perfect tense) practices sin (constantly, present tense), because his seed in him abides (vital power of regeneration), and he is not able to sin (that is, bless the Lord! such a converted one, by the grace of regeneration, is ABLE NOT TO SIN), because of God he has been begotten (and so remains Per. tense). In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil. Not any one that practices not righteousness is of God, and he that loves not his brother."

Let all those who say "I sin every day" see that this passage puts them in the unconverted class of people.

Therefore, a sinning Christian is just as possible as a white black bird.

I. John 5: 18, "We know that not any one, who has been begotten of God (and so remains), sins as a habit. He who was begotten of God (Jesus) keeps him (that is Jesus keeps the one converted), (Eauton, rejected by

Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, and use Auton, him), and the wicked do not handle him."

No converted man or woman is expected to sin after coming to this definite experience, because Jesus can keep us *from* sin, and does not promise to keep us in sin.

I. John 5: 4, "Because all that has been born of God overcomes the world." (Neuter absolute.)

Sins of unaccountable persons are covered by the blood of Christ without a definite act of faith, if they did not produce that state by wilful sin. An act of sin that brings guilt is always voluntary, and an act that may be properly called an infirmity produces a feeling of regret and not guilt. For an infirmity is not a sin, for Paul took pleasure in his infirmities and he did not take pleasure in sins.

Sinning is possible under the constitution of things, but it need not be a fact in my history after I have been converted.

There are four definitions of sin in the New Testament as follows:

Rom. 14: 23, "But he that doubts, if he eat, has been condemned, because (it is) not of faith, and everything which (is) not of faith, sin is." (Literal translation.)

This passage answers the question as to what to do when we are in doubt as to certain things.

Is it of faith in God? Are we in any moral doubt as to whether we as Christians should engage in it, then it is

not of faith in God, and to doubt proves that the action is wrong for a Christian.

Is there any harm in the dance? Is there faith in God in so doing? Is there any harm in playing cards? Is there any faith in God in so doing? Is there any harm in attending the theater? Is there any faith in God in it? Is there any harm in using tobacco? Is there any faith in God in so doing? Remember! Whatsoever is not of faith is sin to every real Christian, and no matter what it is.

James 4: 17, "To (him) knowing therefore good to do, and not doing (it) sin to him it is."

Then one who says, I know I am not what I should be as a Christian! it is a sin to so live. The person conscious of such a condition, is living in daily knowledge and practice of wilful sin.

If any feel that they should have family prayers, or ought to testify, or pray, or make restoration of money or reputations they have injured, or to preach, or go as missionaries, at home or abroad, or should they feel under conviction for entire sanctification, or refuse to walk in any added light whatever, such ones are living in constant disobedience and hence are committing sin just as long as they thus know to do good and refuse to do it.

I. John 3: 4, "Sin is lawlessness" (Anomia, lawlessness, and not A-Nomos, without law), that is they

knew the law, but were lawless in their violation of the same, they had the law, but did not keep it.

Sin is lawlessness, in this, that the man knows he is doing wrong and still keep doing wrong.

False views of conversion have been created by wrong testimonies in the social meetings of the church, and in the homes of professing Christians.

"I make many crooked paths." You do! well your place is at the altar confessing your sins and not standing up to testify. "I do many things I ought not to do." Is that true? Then you should go to the altar and get pardon before you do anything else, and never testify again until you can give in a real statement of facts of personal salvation from sinning.

A drunken man may become a sober man, but a drunken man and a sober man in the same man at the same time is nonsense, and so is the statement that a Christian man and a sinning man can be the same man at the same time.

When a Christian man and a sinning man can be ***both*** at the same time, then a thieving man and an honest man can be both at the same time.

Will sin send me to hell? You must reply yes, it will, for the Word so declares, and you are a professing Christian, and expect to go to heaven, and say that you can be saved from hell, but if you cannot be saved from all sin, and expect to get to heaven, then you take the

ground that you can be saved from hell, but not from sin that sends men there.

Not salvation from hell as a direct statement, but salvation from the sins that send men to hell is what we need.

Salvation from the State's prison, is a statement of delivery from ultimate consequences, what we need is to be saved from that which will send men to the State's prison, and then they will never go there.

"Obedience to escape penalty, is conformity without character." (Hyde, Bowdoin College.)

Do you not think you sin and do not know it? Well! If I sin when I do not know it, how do I know that I do? How does any one know that he does what he does not know that he does?

But I need some sin to keep me humble! Yes, then you need more sin to keep you more humble, then the more sin you have the more humility you have.

No! You have almost been guilty of blasphemy! For humility is a grace of the Holy Spirit, and not the product of sin at all.

Some folks say, "I think I will squeeze in some way." Say, my friend, they have good joints on the doors up there, unlike the joints of admission into some churches here below, and if you make that attempt up there you will be likely to be found dead in the door jam.

If I cannot be saved from all sin, but from some sins,

then I ask the objector to tell me what sins I cannot be saved from?

What one sin can I not be saved from? If I may be saved from all sin but one, then name that one! And if that be so, then we must revise the Decalogue so as to read as follows for certain cases.

For instance, a trolley car conductor, who handles a large amount of small money daily and the tempter suggests that he can take some and it will never be known, and he says *that* is the sin he cannot be saved from, then the commandment should read for him, "Thou shalt not steal, but five cents a day."

Another who loves to tempt the "finny tribe in the river" and has leisure on the Lord's day, must have the commandment changed for him as follows: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it Holy, until three o'clock p. m., then go a fishing."

If I were a sinner and heard a preacher say that a man cannot be saved from all sin and sinning, I would ask him to tell me what one act of sin I could not be saved from. I venture the assertion that he cannot answer that question, and then, if he cannot, he should never make such an absurd and unscriptural statement.

Some one says, "I sin and repent every day." No you do not, and you cannot sin and repent every day, according to the New Testament doctrine of repentance. Repentance is a change of mind, and a REFORM IN

THE LIFE. Many people change their mind who do not reform their life. Many people have changed their minds upon Jesus Christ's salvation, who do not have its in their hearts, and the same can be said in relation to entire sanctification.

Repentance is defined by our Lord in Matt. 21: 28-32. And the fruits in Luke 3: 10-15.

Let us illustrate the spurious doctrine of sinning and repenting. A woman who entertains that notion says to her seven-year-old one day when about to depart to a meeting of the X. Y. Z. society connected with the church of holy shiftlessness, and who had often testified that the idea of these holiness teachers, that one can be saved from all sin, was absurd, for she sinned and repented every day: "Now, Tommy, after I am gone, don't you push that chair up to that cupboard door, and don't you take a spoon and climb up to that preserve jar and eat mamma's preserves; now, do you hear!"

But, no sooner had the dear mamma's back disappeared around the corner than the well-instructed boy proceeded to practice the theology of sinning and repenting, according to maternal theory and practice, for he climbed up and dipped his new Christmas Present spoon into the real preserves made by loving hands, and swallowed the contents thereof with evident satisfaction, and with as much evident satisfaction climbed down and fell upon his knees and said: "Oh, Lord! forgive me!"

And then he endorsed the theology to such a degree that he climbed immediately back and repeated the dose, and climbed down and repented in prayer once more. He was practicing the too common notion of sinning and repenting every day.

Why did he do it? For two reasons. First, he was practising according to the preaching heard. Second, and chiefly, because the boy loved preserves. Do you see? A man steals my chickens and then comes around next day and asks me to forgive him, and I do it; but the next evening he comes again and takes two more, and then comes around the next morning again and says, "I am sorry; will you not please forgive me?" And I do forgive him once more!

The next night he comes and takes the best fall chickens I have, and then comes around and asks forgiveness once more. Now, that is the popular notion of sinning and repenting every day. Yes, that may be fun for him, but it is death on my chickens!

A man could sell coal all day, 1800 pounds for a selling ton, and at night read a chapter and fall on his knees and say: "O, Lord! forgive me? I do those things I ought not to do, and leave undone many things I ought to do." And then he gets into bed and calls that Family Prayers.

The next day he does the same thing, and goes home and reads Gal. 5: 17, and says, "There, I told you one

could not live without sinning every day, for it reads, 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, . . . So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.'" Yes, but that man is making money out of that kind of sinning and repenting. Yes, that old boy likes preserves, too! and he gave $500 toward the new church—all sinning and repenting money—in preserves, too.

Say! You watch the fellow that says, We cannot be saved from all sinning—and you will catch him at it.

If a man does not desire to be clean, he wishes to remain unclean. This false and unscriptural notion of sinning and repenting, has corrupted politics, made much of our social life a cesspool of moral corruption, and put membership in God's Kingdom upon a false basis, and loaded the church up with thousands of unconverted people, and is bearing fruit among the young people in their stoical indifference to deep spiritual things, and a lack of conscientious regard to spiritual conduct, and all over the country thousands and thousands of sinners are going rapidly down to a hell that is bottomless! While, if the professors of the religion of Jesus Christ had the real thing itself, these sinners might be saved to a heaven that is topless.

Oh! May God wake us up to a right view of real scriptural regeneration that saves from all our sins, and then keeps from all sinning.

People in the churches—some of them—talk as

[illegible] to manage the mora[illegible]
[illegible] is that sin never was [illegible]
[illegible] in God's mora[illegible]
[illegible] a hinderer in a[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] womanhood and [illegible]
[illegible] have alluded to [illegible]
[illegible] impression and [illegible]
[illegible] bearing the fruit [illegible]
[illegible] and I propose [illegible]
[illegible] in that liberty where-[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] because each [illegible]
[illegible] and the devil is [illegible]
[illegible] sinner has per-[illegible]

[illegible] necessity then [illegible]
[illegible] for what an [illegible]
[illegible] who compels is the [illegible]

[illegible] and keep us from [illegible]
[illegible] and therefore [illegible] and declare the atonement [illegible] imperfect Savior.

Then God's certificate of approval, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," is an indorsement of a failure.

And when John said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," why he did not mean it, but did mean: "Behold the Lamb of God who cannot keep us from sinning."

And when the Word of God declares that Jesus was to save from sins, why it means, to save us IN sins, and not from sins.

Finally that absurd doctrine of the necessity of sinning and repenting every day never came from the Bible, but was invented by some one who wished to have a theory to suit his practice, for as a rule each one is practising the sin or sins he is defending.

In the face of all this opposition to the doctrine of being saved from all sin and of being kept from all sinning, I repeat this pæan of triumph from Jude I: 24, "To Him who is able (Yes, bless God! Who is able) to keep you without stumbling, and to set (you) before His glory blameless with exultation."

Hallelujah to Jesus forever! Our salvation and preservation is both produced and continued by the unlimited and unlimitable Christ of God, and not at all contingent upon the efforts and power of the human.

The blood cleanses and keeps us free from all sin, and I have known this to be true for over twenty-three years, and I say "Glory!" What do you say?